



THE EARTH

A Monthly Magazine of Sense & Science

Upon A Scriptural Basis,
And of Universal Interest to all Nations and
Peoples under the sun.

EDITED BY E. A. M. B.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

WHICH IS TRUE?

THE GLOBE OF LAND AND WATER

OR

The Level Surface of Water and Land?



6 STATUTE MILES.

"Forty-three years ago, when an atheist THROUGH FALSE ASTRONOMY,
I was converted by the Spirit of God."—*Alex. McInnes.*

"The Earth" contains instructive articles, dealing with
the erroneous teaching of Modern Astronomy; proving
by the indisputable evidence of guaranteed practical
experiment on the Bedford Canal, that Water is LEVEL
and the Earth A PLANE.

Universal Zetetic Society,

Founded in New York in Sept., 1873, and in London in Dec., 1883 (ten years after the American), as *The Zetetic Society*, by "Parallax," and others, is now firmly established by E.A.M.B., (Lady Blount), *Ed. of The Earth*, and her army of helpers, throughout the civilized world. Many local branches of the organization have been started, during the past five years, in all the principal countries, with the exception of Russia, where *The Earth* is not allowed to circulate.

PRESIDENT: LADY E. A. M. BLOUNT,

VICE-PRESIDENT: C. DE LACY EVANS,
(M.R.C.S., Ph. D., etc., late Surgeon, Gold Coast;
Author of "Errors of Astronomy;")

(Dr. C. de Lacy Evans, was Vice-President of the Zetetic Society when first founded.)

COMMITTEE.

Rev. E. W. Bullinger, D.D.	Rev. A. T. de Learsy, D.D.	Albert Smith.
Maj.-Gen. E. Armstrong.	C. W. Makepeace, Esq.	Charles Smith
Rev. E. W. Brookman.	Jno. S. McClelland, Esq.	Isaac Smith, Esq.
Joseph Chamberlain, Esq.	Alex. Mc Innes, Esq.	John Smith, Esq.
Fredk. Evans, Esq.	Rev. E. V. Mulgrave.	H. H. Squire, Esq.
Elder Miles Grant.	Jonathan Nicholson, Esq.	Archbishop C. I. Stevens, D.D., LL.D.
Dr. E. Haughton, M.D., B.A., & <i>Sen. Moderator</i> <i>in Nat. Sc., Trin. Col.</i>	Dr. T. E. Reid.	A. Walter, Esq.
	E. J. Shackleton, Esq.	Capt. West.
	A. E. Skellam, Esq.	

HON. SEC. & TREAS. :

LADY E. A. M. BLOUNT, *Ed. of "The Earth,"*
11, GLOUCESTER ROAD, KINGSTON HILL, SURREY, ENGLAND;
to whom all communications should be addressed.

Our Motto.

"IN VERITATE VICTORIA."

Our Object.

*The propagation of knowledge relating to Natural Cosmogony
in confirmation of the Holy Scriptures, based upon
practical scientific investigation.*

RULES.

1.—The so-called "sciences," and especially Modern Astronomy, to be dealt with from practical data in connection with the Divine System of Cosmogony revealed by the Creator.

2.—*Members* to subscribe Six Shillings a year, which entitles them to two copies of each issue of the Society's Organ, and a copy of every paper issued by the Society. Such will also be eligible to be voted to serve on Committees, to vote on motions, and to propose (subject to Rule 1) any alteration thought to be beneficial to the Society.

3.—*If any lover of Truth desires to become a member of the Universal Zetetic Society, and cannot make it convenient to pay a subscription, it need not deter him or her from joining. Your help will be appreciated in any way that you can give it. Each one can at least help in making known the truth.*

4.—All subscriptions to the Society to be made to the Treasurer, addressed to "Zeteo," at the office of *The Earth*.

Copies of "The Earth" (the Society's Organ), may be had of the Ed., E.A.M.B. (Lady Blount), 11, Gloucester Road Kingston Hill, Surrey, England.

Reprinted from "THE EARTH."

THE WORSHIP OF HUMAN INTELLECT
MUST CEASE:

OR

REMARKS UPON "THE VIEWS OF MODERN SCIENCE"
(A pamphlet by Rev. G. T. Manley, M.A.)

The pamphlet referred to above is evidently written in defence of modern science.

After quoting the names of its founders, which include Newton, Herschel, Professor Adams, Clerk, Maxwell, Boyle, Wallace, Darwin, Sir James Simpson, Prof. Adam Sedgwick, Young, Joule, and Faraday, the writer makes an apology at the bottom of the page—as a footnote—for not including those of Huxley and Tyndall,

However, he regards Faraday, Young, and Joule—as physicists—to be superior to Tyndall: and Darwin—as a biologist—preferable to Huxley. And the "conclusion" of the whole matter may be comprehended by critics for the truth when they consider the writer's summing up, viz: that "all points to one conclusion, that the functions of science (*i.e.*, so-called "science") and Christianity are to purify each other" (!).

I can only express my regret when I see such words as these in print; and the only charitable excuse for the one who penned them—impossible as it may seem—is that he must be ignorant of many of the tenets of both the Bible and modern science, otherwise he could hardly make such a statement.

But the worship of human intellect must cease. The exaltation of the human intellect is one of Satan's most seductive idols, but the time has arrived when it must fall. And the redeemed will be delivered from its snare.

Mr. Manley quotes the following words (which are the words of some individual) quoted by Bishop Butler in his *Analogy of Religion*: "Christianity is not so much as a subject of enquiry.....but it is now discovered to be fiction."

Mr. M. then endeavours to prove therefrom, that because infidelity existed in 1736, "before a word of modern science had been written," therefore it is not a cause for the present prevailing infidelity.

In upholding his position, the writer, after saying, "*I do not think* the state of Christianity so black to-day," asks this

question: "If science is the cause of unbelief at the close of the nineteenth century, what was its cause at the commencement of the eighteenth?" But there is no argument here. It is about equal to the contention that as before a certain disease was known in a particular country where people had suffered and died, therefore it was proven that since it (*i.e.* the new disease) appeared, it could neither be the cause of injury nor death.

The one line of argument is as sensible as the other. It must be apparent that before a thing exists it cannot affect anything. Therefore, before modern science existed it could not have caused infidelity. But now that IT DOES EXIST it is not the *only* cause for unbelief in the Word of God, and the teachings of His Son, Jesus Christ; nevertheless, it is an additional and powerful cause, and its evil influence operates upon two classes, *viz.*: those who understand something about its tenets, and those who know nothing about them, but accept the conclusions of those that do.

Apart from the lines of Truth no man can form satisfactory judgment on anything. The majority of people understand little about modern science, nor do they trouble to understand the truth of the Bible. Therefore they do not know where to set the dividing line between true science, and that which is described in Holy Writ as "science—falsely so-called." Only the measuring rod of truth, prayerfully sought after and sought out, can rightly divide these two.

Truth is the
Key of
Knowledge.

Very many professing Christians go on in a sort of "follow-my-leader" style, never dreaming that they are professing to have faith in two systems which contradict each other, and which if understood could not be held together in a reasonable mind. How can a man believe a thing he does not understand? It is impossible. If a man believes in another man's teaching without understanding it, or proving it to be true, his faith is centred in the reliability of another man's conclusions, but not in a thing which he does not understand.

No! Modern Scripture-contradicting science is *not* the only cause for infidelity, but it is an additional and a powerful cause, and it appears to me that its interpolation is the policy of Satan, and his evil instruments, who, although invisible are only so in substance but not in force of evil,

influence and rule. And thus Satan has retarded the progress and salvation of men, by shaking their faith in God's Word, and in the Creator's own account of His Creation as set forth therein.

I expressed this opinion in an allegorical figure about ten years ago, in my book entitled, *Adrian Galilio*, a song-writer's story. The stanzas I refer to, which portray Satan, as "the the prince of Hades," conversing with one of his evil instruments—the "Spirit-Jester"—are as follows:—

Prince.—Why, Jester, laughing still as ever!

Jester.—I'm mimicking mankind so clever!

Prince.—I hate them for their power of will,
To change their minds, or hold them still!

Jester.—Describe thy plans, detail each stage
For snaring man in Christian age?

Prince.—First, far and wide, shall rise division.
To fog's man's senses, cause derision.
Then strong conceit shall fast increase,
A trap affording no relief.
This spirit, holding men so neat,
Will raise a sect in every street.
For plain I see, through spirit source,
A battle-field right down time's course;
Till the Angel shall the decree enforce,
That "Time shall be no more."

Prince.—^{*}Against their Maker men shall turn,
And strong "delusion" Truth shall spurn;
For this well focussed, and compact,
Imprints untruth as solid fact.
Spirits prepared throughout the ages,
Shall do our will at fitting stages;
Man's word 'gainst God's shall be accepted,
And false Cosmogony erected;
That earth's a tiny whirling globe
Shall men set forth in learned robe;
Above concern if Moses erred,
And Jesus verified his word—
Denying the earth's Creator.

Jester.—Stay, Prince, observe before Times closed,
Our mighty will shall be opposed;

Sneer not at the Zetetic band,
 Goliath fell by David's hand.
 I see a Stone; it taketh aim;
 And hush, I hear its curious strain:

Hypothesis quoted—
 "All matter once floated
 In atoms wide roaming through space;"
 When a power, perhaps "Nether"?
 Pulled all down together;
 How it happened no mortal can trace?

But, dear me! however
 Could there then be a "Nether"?
 Or an *upward* or *downward* at all?
 With "atoms" dis-severed,
 Now gravity-tethered,
 And shooting through space like a ball.

This power of such fame,
 "Gravitation" by name,
 Pounced down on the atoms while strewing;
 But further back gaze,
 O'er eternity's maze,
 What *before* was good gravity doing?

The gravity theory,
 When started, was clearly
 A fancy which Newton had "run";
 Imagine the notion—
 This world, mostly ocean,
 Once a cinder shot out from the sun?

Like Solar relation
 Inherent rotation
 Sent the "globe" whirling round, till full
 soon—
 Just picture the view—
 The sparks, how they flew!
 And a beauty so bright made the moon!

The Sun, the great "Master,"
 Sure, ought to go faster
 Than the sparks it sent backward reviewing;
 Yet globe and moon, too,
 Keep old Sol well in view,
 And play all around while pursuing!

The Globite avers
 It took *millions of years*
 For the earth to develop and cool, Sir;
 But he who will try
 To give God the lie,
 Shall prove himself but Satan's tool, Sir.

Modern science is enveloped about in folds of not commonly understood wordiology. The newest Scientific work on modern science, entitled: *Man's jargon. Place in the Universe*, by Prof. Alfred Wallace, is not exempt from the unseemly drapery of scientific jargon: in fact it is pretty freely padded with it. But is this scientific jargon knowledge? Nay, it is as conventional in its nature as are all other man-made conventionalities and fashions.

MAN'S PLACE IN THE UNIVERSE.

A SONG ON THE GLOBULAR UNIVERSE:

OR

"Globe" on the Brain.

I've just had a look
At W's book,
So its bearings, in song, I'll define,
For my thoughts go and come
In rhymerie's run,
As I step on the critical line.

Refrain—Sir Isaac went far
Beyond reason's bar
When he floated the theory that the earth is a star;
And the same evil blot
Mr. W's got
In his universe pot
For he starts with a globe, thus assuming the lot!

Some scientists shirk
Certain truths in their work,
But here there are palpable reasons
For thinking our earth
Is the only one worth
Populating—because it has seasons.

We make no dissension
With this main contention
Because it seems valid, and clear;
So with Wallace we own
The Earth's peopled alone,
—But he has not proved it a sphere!

This writer's resolved
 "All that is" is evolved,
 No matter what Matter's the cause;
 So plainly we see
 He and Haeckel agree,
 That Matter makes Matter's own laws!

And instead of Genesis
 They've got "Abiogenesis,"
 —A wonderful compound, this word—
 They want "life without life"
 In matter full rife;
 Thus denying all life's from the Lord.

Suns, *counting* to "millions,"
 And stars too in "billions,"
 Formed themselves—so they say—right away,
 And whirling by chance
 A sidereal dance
 They rush in a-maze-(ing) array.

If W is right
 We must doubt our own sight,
 Tho' our sense and our reason resolve;
 For "professors" believe
 Heavenly bodies deceive
 And they only "appear" to revolve!"

"False science" ignores
 God's Word, and His Laws
 And denies that our God did "make man";
 But "man's place" we rehearse
 "In the true Universe"
 Is to work out "His will on His plan."

In nebular fiction
 There's much contradiction,
 The Scriptures it sets at defiance;
 So we stand by the Bible
 And spurn every libel
 Against its true cosmical science.

Then Christian be wise
 And from slumber arise
 Christ's soldiers should stand up and fight
 In strongest accord
 For the Word of the Lord,
 Clad in armour of Truth and of Right.

But I fear that my song
 May be tedious and long.
 With apologies, dear reader, to you,
 This lyric I'll close
 And finish in prose
 The rest of my Wallace Review.

I have noticed that though Mr. Wallace, in his book, goes contrary to some astronomical teachings, he yet endorses the theories which underlie the very foundation of modern astronomy. I will give a few quotations from his book, showing the nature of some of the theories still taught by scientific authorities.

My readers will understand that light is supposed to consist of the wave-vibrations of ether: and scientists are supposed to have measured the length of these wave-vibrations, as also their velocities. Hence we read on p. 27:

“By ingenious experiments the size and rate of vibration of these waves have been measured, and it is found that they vary considerably. Those forming the red light, which is least refracted, having a wave length of about 1 three-hundred-and-twenty-six-thousandth of an inch, while the violet rays at the other end of the spectrum are only about half that length, or 1 six-hundred-and-thirty-thousandth part of an inch.”

The rate at which vibrations succeed each other is from 302 millions of millions per second for the extreme red rays, to 737 millions of millions for those at the violet end of the spectrum.

The new astronomy is generally based on deductions drawn from these theories about light, and light waves; but when they talk of “millions of millions” of vibrations in a second of time, the ordinary mind is fairly bewildered!

Again, we find that the Copernican theory of the world was not generally accepted at first, the objectors saying:—
 “If the earth revolves round the sun at a distance which cannot be less according to Kepler's measurement of the

distance of Mars at opposition than $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of miles, then how is it that the nearer stars are not seen to shift their apparent places when viewed from opposite sides of this enormous orbit?"

Of course the usual assumptions were made to overcome this difficulty; namely, that the stars we look at are such an immense distance from us. But as the writer of the book under consideration adds:—"This seemed wholly incredible even to the great observer Tycho Brahe, and hence the Copernican theory was not so generally accepted as it otherwise would have been."

It is instructive to notice that the sun's distance was then supposed to be $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of millions of miles, whereas we read: "it is now pretty well fixed at about 92,780,000"! This is rather a large difference of opinion, or measurement (?) for an "exact science." But it is noticeable that however many mistaken guesses the astronomers make, their teachings are always supposed to be "scientific"!

In this case even their mistakes must be "scientific" also, that is, they are "scientific mistakes"! We notice, further, that Mr. Wallace bases all his speculations on the theory of Evolution or development: and this theory of development or Evolution is based on the globular theory; the former explanation being the expansion, as it were, of the latter. This theory of Evolution contradicts the very first chapter of Genesis, as also the Fourth Commandment, in which the Creator tells us that he made the World in six literal days like the Sabbath or Seventh Day. But science, of course, knows of no beginning, as is confessed on p. 134 of Mr. Wallace's book. He says:

"It cannot be too often repeated that no explanation; no theory; can ever take us to the beginning of things, but only one or two steps at a time into the dim past, which may enable us to comprehend, however imperfectly, the processes by which the world or the universe as it is, has been *developed* out of some earlier and simpler condition."

So it appears after all that scientists know nothing of the beginning of the world. Thus we see why those who reject the inspired account of Creation, as given in the Word of God, have not only nothing better to offer us in its place; but positively have to confess that they do not know, and cannot reasonably speculate as to how the world or the uni-

verse first began. Then why do they reject or ignore the inspired account? Simply because that account is diametrically opposed to their vain imaginations; and in admitting that account, they would have to admit an all-powerful personal and all-wise Creator. However, there is one conclusion to which Professor Wallace comes, with which Zetetics will readily agree—in fact it is his main contention,—namely, that this is the only habitable world, as far as can be known to science. This is quite contrary to popular astronomical conclusions.

Something, therefore, is gained for the truth. But alas! the truth in this case is marred, because in maintaining his argument the Professor often illogically assumes that the earth is only “another planet.” I will quote some other of his conclusions:—

(1) “That the stellar universe forms one connected whole; and though of immense extent is yet finite, and its extent determinable.”

(2) “That the solar system is situated in the plane of the Milky Way, and not far removed from the centre of that plane. The earth is therefore nearly in the centre of the stellar universe.”

(3) “That this universe consists throughout of the same kinds of matter, and is subjected to the same physical and chemical laws.

(4) “That no other planet in the stellar system than our earth is inhabited or habitable.”

(5) “That the probabilities are almost as great against any other sun (!) possessing inhabited planets.”

(6) “That the nearly central position of our (!) sun is probably a prominent one, and has been especially favourable, perhaps absolutely essential to life *development* upon the earth.”

Thus, we obtain the writer's conclusions in the foregoing six propositions; in the last of which I again notice it is “life *development*” or Evolution, as against Creation.

Now if all the variations of life on this so-called “planet” of “ours” is by *development* or evolution, it would be quite proper to ask how life first started on the earth after it had cooled down sufficiently to form the so-called “crust of the globe.” Was it from a mere “fortuitous concourse of atoms?” Or was the operation directed by some intelligent mind, or cause? And if the latter, then by whose mind was matter directed, and who guided the inert mass, and stamped upon it His design? It appears to me that science, in rejecting the Creation recorded in the Bible, has got into a dense fog, where the wildest speculations prevail and nothing certain can be known.

I deny the possibility of inert matter setting up any automatic force.

The trend of Professor Wallace's argument is seen in the opening of chap. 6, where he says: "Darwin solved the origin of organic species from other species, and thus enabled us to understand how the whole of the existing forms of life have been developed out of pre-existing forms." And he goes on to say that "astronomers hope to be able to solve the problem of the evolution of suns from some earlier stellar types." He adheres to the postulated predication that there is evolution everywhere; and that man has been evolved from lower types: but the author of the book holds himself back, and will not go so far as Darwin did in defining the question of the origin of life. There are two sets of facts, parallel and related, yet at the same time distinct. They are the physical facts of organic chemistry (which is the chemistry of carbon compounds) and the physical facts of organized beings. There is no known reason why we may not make sugar, starch, or albumen from their elements; but that would bring us no nearer to the production of a living starch-cell or the living germ of an egg. What science knows of matter and force gives us no trace of reason to suppose that its "professors" will ever produce a living organism—unless another order of existence is added to them—the psychical: life, mind, will.

Life comes from life only; therefore, spontaneous generation, i.e., "abiogenesis," is a leap into illogical darkness. Where life appears there must be a life-giver—and that brings us to the Eternal self-existent Life-Giver whom we know as God—The Lord God-Jehovah, Creator of Heaven and Earth. Mr. Wallace says. "there *may* be, and *probably* are, other universes, *perhaps* other kinds of matter, and subject to other laws, *perhaps* more like our conceptions of the ether, *perhaps* wholly non-material, and what we can only conceive as spiritual." Five assumptions in five lines. "Perhaps" and "may be."

The author of the work under notice has shown no faith in the God of the Bible as the Creator, and in Jesus Christ as his Redeemer. But he has shown his belief in Spiritualism, which I understand he expounded and openly defended over twenty years ago.

In some respects Dr. Wallace and Mr. Bruce Wallace are

of the same calibre in regard to spiritualism : and neither of them will definitely assert his belief in one self-existent Eternal Being, the Creator of all, by whose creative Word all things came into existence ; because both their minds are darkened by the false idea of evolution, and the evils of spiritualism : so I am informed. But Dr. Wallace seems to have ceased making any open confession, he simply leaves us to suppose he inclines to the belief of man having a spiritual side to his organization, by quoting a few lines by Tennyson and Shakespeare here and there. And he flavours his writings with spicy lines such as : "What a piece of work is man. How noble in reason ! How infinite in faculty !In action how like an angel !"

" Spirit, nearing yon dark portal
At the limit of thy human state,
Fear not thou the hidden purpose
Of that Power which alone is Great.
Nor the myriad world, His shadow,
Nor the silent opener of the Gate."

This may be all very beautiful ; and no doubt to the mind of Tennyson the concept conveyed in the teaching of the inherent Immortality of Man, apart from Christ, was a traditional one. But in any case the Bible and the God of the Bible are entirely left out, and ignored by the author of *Man's Place in the Universe*.

According to Dr. A. Wallace the faith which professors of modern science have hitherto placed in Sir Isaac Newton's theory of gravitation is somewhat slacking down, and its power of attraction is fading away. This is evident from Prof. Wallace's statements as follows. He says :

" One of the greatest difficulties with regard to the vast system of stars around us is the question of its permanence and stability..... But our mathematical astronomers can find no indications of such stability of the stellar universe as a whole, if subject to the law of gravitation alone. In reply to some questions on this point, my friend, Professor George Darwin writes as follows : ' A symmetrical annual system of bodies might revolve in a circle with or without a central body. Such a system would be unstable. If the bodies are of unequal masses and not symmetrically disposed, the break-up of the system would probably be more rapid than in the ideal case of symmetry. Mr. E.T. Whittaker (Secretary to the Royal Astronomical Society), to whom Professor Darwin sent my Questions, writes : I doubt whether the principal phenomena of the stellar universe are consequences of the law of gravitation at all.' "

Then after quoting Professor Newcomb's calculation as to the

“Effect of gravitation in a universe of 100 million stars, each five times the mass of our sun, and spread over a sphere which it would take light 30,000 years to cross:”

with which he is not in harmony, he also states that :

“it is questionable whether the effect, which we call ‘gravitation,’ given by Isaac Newton, is the cause of results in connection with the principal phenomena of the stellar universe.

“I have been working myself at spiral nebulae,” says Prof. Wallace, “and have got a first approximation to an explanation—but it is electro—dynamical and not gravitational.”

Accepting two different mathematician's opinions the writer says that :

“We need not limit ourselves to the laws of gravitation as having determined the present form of the stellar universe ; and this is the more important because we may thus escape from a conclusion which many astronomers seem to think inevitable, viz., that the observed proper motions of the stars cannot be explained by gravitative forces of the system itself.”

Therefore the idea of *gravitation* (which truly belongs to the regions of metaphysics, existing only in imagination and not in fact) is falling into discredit, and one might almost say into disrepute. Professor Wallace's book sheds more than one ray of hope that the light of reason is dawning upon the minds of some of the science-makers, the evidence of which appears in one of his quotations from Professor Huxley :—“that the results you get out of the ‘mathematical mill’ depend entirely on what you put into it.”

True ! If you put 0 in you'll get 0 out. And my advice in seeking after truth is this : if you don't possess a real standard unit to start your mill, don't forge one ! It won't pay in the long run, because although the faith some have in the Bible may be very weak in comparison to that which they have placed in this world's “wisdom” yet honesty will ever be found “the best policy.” But earnest Christians who are real truth-seekers and truth-lovers will never relax their faith in the Bible, when they have proved it to be true, because they “know whom they have believed” in too real a sense ever possibly to be shaken by any mere man-made system, however cunningly it may be constructed.

Prof. Wallace has ingeniously endeavoured to make the various portions of the globular hypothesis dovetail into each

other, and thus present a glossed surface of apparent consistency ; that is, in the eyes of some, but *not of all*. Because personally I can perceive no true gloss of beauty. But nevertheless the most carefully polished fallacy can only present external and transient attractions, even to those whose minds have been grossly fed upon that which will not stand the searching test of the Word of the Living God. Moreover, the most cleverly framed Scripture-contradicting myths present no "face value" to the keen truth-seeker. No mere superficial glitter can hide from his penetrating gaze unsoundness which lies beneath. And in spite of adroit burnishing performed with rare agates carefully prepared for the purpose by the author of all lies, still he who rests in the Word of the Lord *knows assuredly* that *only* "*The foundation of God standeth sure,*" and everything built on other foundation—however apparently smooth may be its surface—*must* eventually come to nought, and *fall to rise no more!*

Prof. Wallace has taken the globe theory for his basis, therefore his primary assumptions remain unproved, and, at the risk of offending the great upholders of "The New Astronomy," I will venture to mention some things which refuse to "fall into line" with ordinary common-sense deductions.

Take, for example, the theory about the origin of the moon, and the formation of the ocean beds. Professor Darwin—who appears to be Dr. Wallace's oracle—originated the former notion, which is that the earth, at some remote date, (being still in a practically fluid condition,) was spinning round at a rate variously estimated at from 2 to 4 hours per turn ; it bulged out in the equatorial regions ; and matters reached a critical climax when the centrifugal force overcame the gravitational and cohesive powers of the rotating ellipsoid. Two or more pieces were torn out of its flanks, and ultimately coalesced—forming the moon.

What a strange conception ! The pieces *are said* to have kept at first in close proximity to the earth's surface, though gradually, the loosened masses were pushed outwards, further and further away from the earth. Here Dr. Wallace has placed himself on the horns of a mechanical dilemma seeing that if the mass that was ultimately to make up the moon detached itself in separate pieces from the fast revol-

ing earth (through excess of centrifugal force) the various pieces must—according to the Law of Mechanics—have been flung outwards at a tangent normal to the radius drawn to the point of separation; though if the earth were in a more or less fluid condition—as these professors maintain—the separation would not necessarily be an abrupt one. That makes it more difficult for one to imagine how the separation of a fluid mass can be affected in separate portions.

Without carrying this point as far as I should fairly be entitled to do, I will simply ask—if this is a fact—whether anything (apart from intelligence) could cause these portions to be exactly balanced, and exactly on opposite sides? If they were not so balanced, and on exactly opposite sides, with such a high speed of rotation they would throw the main body, just as a fast-running and ill-balanced pulley can shake a mill wall to pieces. The earth would not travel along its orbit in a smooth line, but would describe a subsidiary small orbit round the common centre of gravity formed by its own mass, and that of the detached portions, independent of the rotation on its axis (though how a globe, rushing through space, can rotate on its axis is inconceivable). If the union of the various fragments took place suddenly, and while still in close proximity to the earth, the throwing effect I have referred to would be intensified.

But I again state that, apart from agreeing with Dr. Wallace that the stars are not other inhabited worlds, and that the whole universe is so constructed as to be adapted to man's organism and necessities, I look upon "The New Astronomy," from its foundation as a pagan delusion and God-denying theory.

I note that Prof. Wallæe state the mass of the moon to be one-fiftieth of that of the earth; but Sir Robert Ball, in *Earth's Beginning*, put it at one-eightieth. Who is correct, Sir Robert Ball, or Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace?

I am not interested to know which moon-theory the learned doctor espouses—for I take the Bible and my own God-given senses alone as my guide in the matter; but it seems right to expose these fallacies in detail, wearying though it may be.

Among other things, Dr. Wallace makes out, in conjunction with Mr. Ormond Fisher, that the pieces which detached themselves from the earth, to form the moon, left pits, which served subsequently to become the basins of the seas. He

always says that these ocean beds are placed in almost complete symmetry with regard to the equator. This is not so. He further says (on p. 275), that "the highest mountains in every part of the globe very often exhibit on their loftiest summits stratified rocks, which contain marine organisms, and were, therefore, originally laid down beneath the sea." If this be so, what about the "moon-prepared ocean bed?"

Dr. Wallace tells us (on p. 234) that, it has been shown by means of the spectroscope, that double stars of short period do originate from a single star (as the moon originated from the earth); "but in these cases it seems probable that the parent star is in the gaseous state," and thus we are told new stars are made from old ones "while we wait"! So say these modern science satellites!

Under the heading, "The sun a typical star," readers are treated to a short discourse upon "sun-spots," and that the body of the sun is gaseous; but, what we commonly term the sun is really the bright spherical nucleus of a nebulous body. "This" semi-liquid glowing surface is termed the photosphere, since from it are given out the light and heat which reach the earth." Immediately above this surface is the "reversing layer, consisting of dense metallic vapours, only a few hundred miles thick (!). Above the reversing layer comes the chromosphere—surrounding the sun to a depth of about 4,000 miles. The chromosphere and its quiescent prominences appear to be truly gaseous, consisting of hydrogen, helium, and coronium, while eruptive prominences show the presence of metallic vapours, especially calcium.....Beyond the red chromosphere and prominences is the marvellous white glory of the corona which extends to an enormous distance round the sun." Immensity in size and speed seems to be the acme of the astronomer's imagination.

Dr. Wallace states that the stars are suns, and on p. 143, referring to the age of the sun, says: "enormous epochs during which our sun has supported life upon this earth—must have been incomparably less than its whole existence as a light giver—that the life of most stars must be counted by hundreds, or perhaps by thousands of millions of years." (Of course this includes the earth, from which the moon was shot off!)

Now whether Dr. Wallace is correct regarding the nature of the sun's component parts, I will refrain from expressing my opinion, further than to say that to some extent at least I doubt its accuracy. But I know that he is wrong regarding the age of the sun and stars; because in his statements he has contradicted the Scriptures, wherein we read that God created the sun and the moon on the fourth day of Creation week—and the stars also (see *Gen. i.*)

Regarding motion, the author of this book says: "How these motions originated and are regulated we do not know, but there they are;" and, speaking of the motions of the stars, he says: "although they appear to move in straight lines, they may really be moving in curved orbits."

True Zetetics love facts and seek them, but nothing is a fact which is contrary to the Creator's Word. Yet alas! even as evil men denied and killed the Prince of Life, so do many now deny, and seek to slay the Word of Truth.

One of Prof. Wallace's primary contentions is, that the earth is the only inhabited world. This, as I have already stated, on Bible lines *we endorse*; but, apart from Holy Writ, we think it impossible to come to such a conclusion from the professor's standpoint; because as he describes the principles and physical conditions of all human life, and its basis, to consist of the elements of oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen, and carbon, it does not follow God could not create life upon a physical basis entirely different from ours, and completely beyond our conception.

